UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
LIMITED

E/AC.51/1996/L.5/Add.30
25 June 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME AND COORDINATION
Thirty-sixth session
3 to 28 June 1996 (Part I)

DRAFT REPORT

Addendum

Rapporteur: Mr. Volodymyr Y. YELCHENKO (Ukraine)

PROGRAMME QUESTIONS: EVALUATION

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the in-depth evaluation of peace-keeping operations: termination phase

1. At its 2nd and 3rd meetings, on 3 and 4 June 1996, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the in-depth evaluation of peace-keeping operations: termination phase (E/AC.51/1996/3, annex).

Discussion

2. Delegations agreed with the emphasis in the report on learning from experience, and considered that a systematic approach to building up and maintaining institutional memory was crucial and would generate savings in the future. Many delegations also noted that translating the lessons of experience into improved policies and procedures was important and required that regular, predictable financing should be provided to the Lessons Learned Unit of the Department of Peace-keeping Operations, as recommended by the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (A/51/130, para. 50). Other delegations considered that the appropriate concept was "predictable funding". Several delegations stated that the lessons learned in peace-keeping should be distributed in all official languages to all Member States and on a regular basis to all bodies concerned, including the Special Committee, for their consideration and approval. Several delegations stated that the "lessons learned" process should not be limited to the Department of Peace-keeping Operations but should apply to all departments and organizations involved.

3. Many delegations stated that the broad approach taken to the termination phase was helpful. Others considered that the report should have concentrated on the specific elements of the problems of the termination phase as such. Some delegations expressed their disappointment at the rather loose way in which that important subject had been addressed. Other delegations stated that greater consideration should have been given to drawing lessons from experience with the termination of problematic missions. Given the complex nature of the termination phase, delegations emphasized the importance of a coordinated framework to integrate the efforts of the various entities involved without prejudice to the different ways of funding the activities concerned. Some delegations welcomed the findings of the report on peace-building. Other delegations pointed out that the question of peace-building and related matters was being dealt with by other bodies, such as the General Assembly's Informal Open-ended Working Group on An Agenda for Peace, stressed that there was currently no agreement on the question, and regretted its inclusion in the report. Several delegations stated that the proposed review of policy concerning the disposition of assets was timely; some considered that there was a need to apply a cost-benefit approach.

4. With regard to the major components enumerated in table 2 of the report, several delegations reiterated that there was no legislative basis for that listing of components. They deeply regretted the inclusion in the report of concepts which had not been approved by the General Assembly and were still being negotiated in the Working Group on An Agenda for Peace. Other delegations noted that since the components could be included in peace-keeping operations if the Security Council so mandated, and had been so included in the past, it was appropriate that they be listed and that capacity for action in those areas be maintained. Some delegations noted problems of translation in the Spanish version of table 2 and considered that the words intervención inmediata should be replaced by the words despliegue rápido. Some delegations strongly rejected the affirmation that civil society was the backbone of a political system, and stressed in that regard the central and important role that Government played in maintaining the political system in each country.

5. In the course of the debate, some delegations made observations on a number of the recommendations in the report.

6. Recommendation 1. Some delegations considered that the recommendation should include the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, to which the present report should be submitted.

7. Recommendation 3 (a). Some delegations considered that the following phrase should be added: "and present them for consideration and approval, as appropriate, to the relevant intergovernmental bodies, including the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations".

8. Recommendation 3 (c). Several delegations emphasized that the secondments proposed in the recommendation should be resorted to only if the regular and predictable financing recommended by the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations in its report to the General Assembly was not forthcoming; other delegations expressed their concern about the implications of

recommendation 3 (c). They regretted the growing imbalance within the Department of Peace-keeping Operations between posts financed from the regular budget and the peace-keeping support account, and the number of military officers on loan. They also noted that the use of loaned personnel should be temporary, and urged the Secretary-General and the competent bodies of the General Assembly to take steps to correct the imbalance by providing necessary financing for posts currently occupied by officers on loan and by recruitment for those posts, in accordance with established procedures. They stressed that the planning function of activities of the Department of Peace-keeping Operations needed regular and predictable financing. In that context, they requested the Secretary-General to make every effort to ensure respect for the principle of equitable geographical representation. Other delegations noted the primary importance of Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations. Many delegations recalled the detailed report that the Secretary-General had to submit to the General Assembly on various aspects of the question, and expressed the view that the recommendation should be further discussed after the consideration of that report.

9. Recommendation 4. Several delegations proposed the deletion of the phrase "of multi-component peace-keeping missions". They also stressed that demobilization, resettlement and reintegration of uprooted populations were not activities to be implemented by the Department of Peace-keeping Operations, which did not have a mandate for them. Those delegations stressed that they agreed only to the general principle of designation of the centres but emphasized that evaluation of the above-mentioned activities was not within the Department's mandate, so that the recommendation should be elaborated, stressing that those activities were within the competence of such other bodies as UNHCR and the Department of Humanitarian Affairs.

10. Recommendations 6, 7, 9 and 11. Many delegations emphasized that, in the absence of agreement on the concepts, policies and practices relating to peace-building as an integral part of peace-keeping, or on the role and scope of involvement of UNDP in peace-keeping missions, discussions on the recommendations should await the outcome of the work of the Working Group on An Agenda for Peace. Those delegations rejected the concept of peace-building as an integral part of peace-keeping operations. Other delegations particularly welcomed the findings and recommendations of the report on peace-building. They stressed that peace-building should be an integral part of all peace-keeping operations and that failure to adopt a planned and coordinated approach to it risked squandering an often fragile peace and with it significant investments by the international community.

11. Recommendations 8, 10 and 13. Some delegations stated that any actions on those recommendations should be based on decisions of relevant intergovernmental bodies.

12. Recommendation 14 (c). Some delegations expressed the view that the proposed retention of military personnel to assist in securing the assets of a mission after the end of its political mandate would require the prior approval of the Security Council.

13. Recommendation 16. Some delegations cautioned that in implementing the recommendation care must be taken not to infringe upon national sovereignty, and proposed that the question of drafting guidelines for field operations in countries experiencing continuing civil strife should be examined by the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. Other delegations fully supported the recommendation.

Conclusions and recommendations

14. The Committee expressed appreciation for the report and agreed with the emphasis in the report on learning from experience.

15. The Committee endorsed recommendations 2, 5, 12, 14 (a) and (b) and 15 (b).

16. There was no agreement in the Committee on recommendations 3 (c), 6, 7, 9, 11 and 16. The Committee therefore recommended that they be examined further by the relevant intergovernmental bodies. With respect to recommendation 7, the Committee did not intend by that action to prohibit the Lessons Learned Unit of the Department of Peace-keeping Operations from assessing experience with any mandated activities of completed peace-keeping missions.

17. The Committee endorsed recommendations 1, 3 (a) and (b), 4, 14 (c) and 15 (a) with the following modifications and understandings:

Recommendation 1

The words "the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations" were inserted before the words "and the Inter-Agency Working Group".

Recommendation 3

In the chapeau, the word "multi-component" was deleted.

Recommendation 3 (a)

The words "and present them for consideration and approval, as appropriate, to the relevant intergovernmental bodies, including the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations" were added at the end of the subparagraph.

Recommendation 4

The words "of multi-component peace-keeping missions" were deleted. With that change the recommendation was endorsed, on the understanding that that was an endorsement of the general principle of designation of responsibility centres and did not imply that the Department of Peace-keeping Operations had responsibility for any functions beyond those in its mandate.

Recommendation 14 (c). The words "with the prior approval of the Security Council" were added at the end of the first sentence.

Recommendation 15 (a)

The words "after a peaceful transfer of power to constituted government" and the words "and the continuing peace-building requirements of the new situation created by the mission" were deleted.

18. The Committee took note of recommendations 8, 10 and 13, on the understanding that any actions on those recommendations should be based on decisions of the relevant intergovernmental bodies.

19. The Committee requested that the report, together with the conclusions and the recommendations of the Committee on it, should be transmitted to the Informal Open-ended Working Group of the General Assembly on An Agenda for Peace, the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and other intergovernmental bodies addressing the questions raised in the report, for consideration and appropriate action.